United Nations A/C.2/60/SR.38

General Assembly
Sixtieth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
30 January 2006

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 38th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 16 December 2005, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Koudelka (Vice-Chairman) ..... Czech Republic

Contents

Agenda item 52: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(g) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (*continued*)

Agenda item 54: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(c) International migration and development (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

05-64805 (E)

In the absence of Mr. Wali (Nigeria), Chairman, Mr. Koudelka (Czech Republic), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.50 p.m.

Agenda item 52: Sustainable development *(continued)*

(g) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa *(continued)* (A/C.2/60/L.34, A/C.2/60/L.65 and A/C.2/60/L.74)

Draft resolution on the International Year of Deserts and Desertification, 2006

1. **Mr. Sermoneta** (Israel) introduced document A/C.2/60/L.65, containing his country's proposed amendment to the draft resolution before the Committee. Israel was a world leader in research on desertification and land degradation and its scientists gladly shared their expertise and had for many years been active in extending technical assistance to countries affected by those phenomena, especially in Africa.

2. For those reasons, his delegation had participated in the informal consultations on both draft resolutions under agenda item 52 (g) and had sought to include in draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34 a paragraph welcoming the decision of the Government of Israel to host an international conference on desertification in connection with the observance of the International Year of Deserts and Desertification, 2006. It was common practice for the General Assembly to recognize initiatives taken by Member States on issues of global importance. Indeed, the draft resolution already included a paragraph relating to such an initiative by another Member State.

3. It had gradually become clear that, despite wide support for Israel's proposal, it would not be possible to incorporate it into the draft resolution and the negotiations had consequently been brought to a grinding halt. Because of that obvious discrimination — which was not only pernicious per se but also insulting in the light of the contributions Israel had made to fighting desertification — his delegation had been compelled to introduce the desired text as an amendment. He called on Committee members to vote in favour of the amendment in order to reaffirm the fundamental principle of equal treatment of all Member States.

4. **The Chairman** said that a recorded vote on the proposed amendment had been requested.

5. **Mr. Diaw** (Mauritania), speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the issue of combating desertification was indeed of the utmost importance; however, the delegation proposing the draft amendment was not as committed to fighting desertification as it claimed to be. Israel was seeking international endorsement and support for its planned conference on desertification even though it had refused to take responsibility for its own desertification-causing practices. Those unlawful and devastating practices had been well documented in various reports, including the report prepared by the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia on the economic and social repercussions of the Israeli occupation on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan (A/60/65-E/2005/13, annex). The Committee itself had recently adopted a draft resolution condemning the illegal exploitation of Palestinian land, the detrimental effects of the unlawful construction of the wall, the uprooting of fruit-bearing trees and the razing of land in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the occupied Syrian Golan (A/C.2/60/L.11/Rev.1).

6. The Arab Group therefore found it difficult to accept the Israeli amendment and would vote against it. It invited all Member States to give serious consideration to the grave implications of adopting the paragraph.

7. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment proposed by Israel, contained in document A/C.2/60/L.65.*

In favour:

Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania,

Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Mali, Nicaragua, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

8. *The amendment proposed by Israel, contained in document A/C.2/60/L.65, was adopted by 83 votes to 34, with 30 abstentions.*

9. **Ms. Walpole** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union had supported the inclusion of the paragraph because it believed that it was fair to include mention in the resolution of any government-sponsored international meeting that would focus on, and contribute to, the objectives of the International Year of Deserts and Desertification. The proposed Be'er Sheva conference fit those criteria.

10. **Mr. Mabhongo** (South Africa) said that his delegation continued to support the Middle East peace process and all efforts aimed at bringing lasting peace to that important part of the world. It had voted in favour of the amendment, in the belief that the conference would provide an opportunity for sharing information and hoped that it would address the root causes of desertification, especially in the Middle East, as well as in other parts of the world, and that all who wished to attend would be permitted to do so.

11. **Mr. Tharyat** (Indonesia) said that Indonesia had always attached great importance to the international community's efforts to remedy the problems caused by land degradation and desertification and was concerned about the donor community's rapidly flagging interest in providing financing for the implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification.

12. It was disheartening that a recorded vote had had to be taken in connection with the draft resolution on the International Year of Deserts and Desertification. His delegation was in no way opposed to the convening of international conferences to deal with desertification issues; however, to have real meaning such conferences must have the participation of countries that were directly affected. If the conference were held in Israel a number of seriously affected countries might not be able to participate due to technical constraints or because of strong political principles. For that reason, his delegation had voted against the proposed amendment.

13. **Mr. Rimdap** (Nigeria) said that although Nigeria condemned any act by the Israelis in the occupied Arab territories, including the Palestinian territories his delegation had voted in favour of the proposed amendment in the belief that a conference on desertification was a technical issue of interest to every country.

14. **Mr. Diaw** (Mauritania), speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States, proposed the insertion of a new paragraph — the text of which was contained in document A/C.2/60/L.74 — after the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34 to provide essential balance to the text following the adoption of the amendment proposed by Israel. The language of the proposed amendment was virtually identical to that contained in a resolution the Committee had adopted two weeks earlier (A/C.2/60/L.11/Rev.1) whereby delegations had expressed their concern at the extensive destruction by Israel the occupying Power, of agricultural land and orchards in the Occupied

Palestinian Territory, including the uprooting of a vast number of fruit-bearing trees.

15. The proposed amendment was directly linked to the draft resolution before the Committee in both its substance and implications and addressed an issue that gravely aggravated desertification in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the occupied Syrian Golan. The issue had been extensively detailed in numerous reports by the United Nations, most recently in the report of the Secretary-General containing the report of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs on vegetation loss in Beit Hanoun during the 2001-2004 period. The Palestinian people had suffered far too long under Israel's policies of bulldozing their agricultural fields, uprooting their fields and trees and converting their scarce green areas and fruit-bearing orchards into arid deserts. That had and would continue to spell food dependency and deprivation for the Palestinian people, rather than a future of hope and economic opportunity. The Arab Group therefore urged all delegations to support the inclusion of the paragraph.

16. **The Chairman** said that a recorded vote on the proposed amendment contained in document A/C.2/60/L.74 had been requested.

17. **Mr. Sermoneta** (Israel), making a general statement before the vote, expressed his delegation's surprise at the introduction of a text that, had not been brought up during the lengthy deliberations on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34 and noted that the language of the proposed paragraph was a transplant from a resolution on an entirely different matter that would be more appropriately addressed in other forums. He therefore urged the initiators of the text to reconsider its introduction.

18. **Mr. Alsaker** (Norway), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that even though his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution on the permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people over their natural resources, it would vote against the proposed amendment for the latter was not sufficiently relevant to the topic under consideration and might even prove counterproductive in terms of making the International Year a platform for united efforts to deal effectively with desertification. The focus must be kept on the actual issue, namely, efforts to combat desertification.

19. **Mr. Kotis** (United States of America) said that the United States would vote against the proposed amendment, which was inappropriate for what should be a technical resolution focused on efforts to tackle the challenges of desertification, and he urged other delegations to do likewise. He viewed it as a transparent attempt to politicize what should be an apolitical resolution and served as a reminder that some delegations placed a premium on political grandstanding over practical solutions aimed at addressing real challenges.

20. **Ms. Walpole** (United Kingdom), said that the United Kingdom would vote against the proposed amendment, which was inappropriate and unnecessary in relation to the agenda item. Her delegation was dismayed that the amendment had been introduced at the very last moment and had not been formally circulated until that day.

21. **Mr. Al-Ghanim** (Kuwait) said that the proposed amendment was very relevant to the draft resolution, as it dealt with a basic development issue, namely, agriculture, and the Palestinian people's right to development.

22. **Mr. Brousseau** (Canada) said that, in the specific context of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34, the proposed amendment was inappropriate and superfluous. His delegation was also concerned that the amendment had been put forward at the last minute and had not been formally circulated in sufficient time to be studied by Committee members. His delegation would vote against it.

23. **Ms. Kostensen** (Denmark) said that her delegation would vote against the proposed amendment. Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34 was a technical resolution that should not be burdened with political and unbalanced text elements. The Arab Group's concerns should be dealt with under the agenda item on the Middle East peace process.

24. **Mr. Hamburger** (Netherlands) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people over their natural resources, it would vote against the proposed amendment, which was inappropriate and unnecessary in the context of the agenda item. As stated by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the European Union in the explanation of vote on the draft resolution on permanent sovereignty, the issues referred to in the

proposed amendment were matters that needed to be dealt with in the framework of the permanent-status negotiations of the Middle East peace process. Lastly, his delegation was dismayed that the amendment had been put forward at the very last moment.

25. **Mr. Hijazi** (Observer for Palestine), making a general statement, lamented that the ready accusation of politicizing the issue was levelled against every proposal to incorporate a reference to the Occupied Palestinian Territory in a resolution. It was quite clear from the language of the proposed paragraph that it was to be construed in the context of desertification.

26. Moreover, since all Member States would be working hard to address the issue of desertification in a comprehensive manner in the International Year, it would be counterproductive to exclude the issue of desertification in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem. The proposed paragraph was directly linked to the draft resolution before the Committee in both its substance and implications. At issue were the policy-driven actions of Israel, the occupying Power, that directly and indirectly contributed to the aggravation of desertification in the Middle East. He appealed to all Committee members to give the proposed paragraph their support.

27. **Mr. Sermoneta** (Israel) said that his delegation was disappointed that such a politicized text was being forced forward by its initiators since throughout negotiations it had been politicization that had held back consensus. The late introduction of a totally unrelated text left no doubt that the sole purpose of its originators was to try and "neutralize" the positive reference to Israel just voted into the draft resolution. His delegation would vote against the proposed amendment and called on all those delegations that were concerned by the issue at hand, the rationalization of the work of the General Assembly and the detrimental effects of undue politicization of the work of the United Nations to do likewise.

28. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment proposed by Mauritania on behalf of the Group of Arab States, contained in document A/C.2/60/L.74.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, China, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Suriname, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

29. The amendment proposed by Mauritania on behalf of the Group of Arab States, contained in document A/C.2/60/L.74, was adopted by 48 votes to 29, with 74 abstentions.*

30. **Mr. Sinha** (India) said that his delegation had abstained from the vote simply because it was

* The delegation of Papua New Guinea subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote against the amendment contained in A/C.2/60/L.74.

disappointed that political elements had been inserted into the draft resolution.

31. **Ms. Bauzán de Senes** (Uruguay) said that her delegation had abstained even though it had voted earlier in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.11/Rev.1, because the paragraph in question had been taken out of context and had nothing to do with the International Year of Deserts and Desertification.

32. **The Chairman** informed the Committee that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34 as a whole.

33. **Ms. Quintavalle** (Italy) said that her delegation wished to propose further amendments; these had been agreed to by all delegations during informal meetings. The fourth preambular paragraph should now read "Conscious of the need to raise public awareness and to protect the biological diversity of deserts as well as indigenous and local communities and the traditional knowledge of those affected by this phenomenon."; in the fifth preambular paragraph, the words "to host a world summit" should be replaced by "to convene and host an international conference with the participation of Heads of State and Government"; in paragraph 3, the words "Also reiterates its call to" should be replaced by "Encourages"; in paragraph 4, the words "Calls upon" should be replaced by "Invites"; and in paragraph 7, the words "Invites the Global Environment Facility" should be replaced by "Notes with interest the decision of the Global Environment Facility Council".

34. **Ms. Gordon** (Jamaica), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, asked for the meeting to be suspended so that they could look at the proposed amendments.

The meeting was suspended at 4.40 p.m. and resumed at 5.15 p.m.

35. **The Chairman** said that he took it that the Committee wished to adopt the amendments to draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34 proposed by Italy.

36. *It was so decided.*

37. **The Chairman** informed the Committee that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34 as a whole, as amended.

38. **Mr. Al-Ghanim** (Kuwait), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that, despite the amendments, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole because the latter addressed an important development issue.

39. **Ms. Quintavalle** (Italy), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, as amended, in order to reaffirm its role as the main sponsor of the International Year of Deserts and Desertification. It deeply regretted that it had not been possible to adopt the resolution by consensus. Her delegation hoped that the unnecessary confrontations and divisions that had characterized approval of the draft resolution would not affect the Year's success.

40. **Mr. Sermoneta** (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation would be constrained to abstain from the vote on the draft resolution as a whole because of the amendment that had been introduced and adopted at that meeting. His delegation had approached negotiations in a constructive and professional fashion with a view to contributing to the international community's efforts regarding desertification. Israel was grateful to those delegations that had supported the inclusion of a paragraph welcoming its initiative to host an international conference on desertification.

41. Unfortunately, some delegations — including from countries likely to send representatives to the said conference — believed that Israel should be discriminated against and had made every effort to keep any positive reference to Israel out of the draft resolution. Having failed in those efforts, they had introduced language from an unrelated resolution and that language had been adopted. In doing so, they had not only provided conclusive proof of their real motives, but had also caused considerable damage, throwing what was supposed to be a straightforward consensus resolution into disarray, making a mockery of desertification and trampling on the concerns of an entire continent. If in a year of revival and reform it was still possible for a few delegations to hold the Committee hostage to anachronistic whims on a simple resolution, something was definitely wrong.

42. Notwithstanding, Israel acknowledged the overall importance that the international community attached to combating desertification, supported efforts in that regard and reiterated its strong commitment to the spirit of the resolution and the many constructive aspects thereof.

43. **Mr. Sabbagh** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution because of the amendment introduced by Israel. While claiming to be in the forefront of efforts to combat desertification, Israel was actually contributing to desertification in the occupied Arab lands. Its uprooting of trees in the occupied territories and burial of nuclear waste in the occupied Syrian Golan had been documented in the report prepared by the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia and in that of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories (contained, respectively, in documents A/60/65-E/2005/13 and A/60/380). In a resolution adopted earlier that year, the Committee had called upon Israel to cease endangering natural resources and dumping various kinds of waste in the occupied territories.

44. His delegation had supported the original text of the draft resolution, and it had welcomed all subsequent amendments thereto, except for the one introduced by the representatives of the Israeli occupation authorities.

45. **Mr. Al-Rasheed** (Saudi Arabia), speaking in explanation of the vote before the vote, said that, although his delegation supported the draft resolution, it would have to abstain because, for legal reasons it could not support certain paragraphs.

46. **Mr. Al-Athra** (Qatar), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution because it supported development and combating desertification. It welcomed Algeria's offer to host the conference.

47. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34, as amended.*

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Syrian Arab Republic.

Abstaining:

Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

48. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34, as amended, was adopted by 111 votes to 1, with 42 abstentions.*

49. **Mr. Abdelbary** (Sudan) said that despite his delegation's support for all the issues addressed, it had abstained in the vote because of the inclusion of the paragraph proposed by Israel, which was unacceptable and ran counter to the resolution.

50. **Mr. Gomez Robledo** (Mexico) said that his delegation had voted against the amendment proposed by the Group of Arab States because it was irrelevant to the resolution, but had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. It regretted the politicization and lack of transparency shown.

51. **Mr. Elmejerbi** (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that the draft resolution just adopted contained positive elements which his delegation supported, including the initiative by Algeria to host the conference. However, it had abstained in the vote because it could not be party to a propaganda campaign by the Israeli occupying authority, which had destroyed acres of agricultural land and fruit trees.

52. **Mr. Salazar** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that his delegation attached great importance to the topic and had voted in favour of the draft resolution. He stressed that the original intention of the Group of 77 and China in introducing the resolution should be recalled.

53. **Mr. Brousseau** (Canada) said that his Government recognized the importance of combating desertification and had already begun preparations for activities in observance of the International Year of Deserts and Desertification. However, because of its concern at the politicization of the process, his delegation had abstained.

54. **Mr. Khan** (Pakistan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it believed that the issues addressed deserved the support of the international community, but it regretted the lack of consensus.

55. **Ms. Tchitanava** (Georgia) said that, had her delegation been present during the vote, it would have abstained.

56. **Mr. Khammanichanh** (Lao People's Democratic Republic) said that his delegation had not intended to participate in the vote and requested that the record be corrected.

Agenda item 54: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(c) International migration and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.16, A/C.2/60/L.62 and A/C.2/60/L.70)

Draft resolution on international migration and development

57. **The Chairman** recalled that paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.62 had been orally amended by the addition of the words "within existing resources" to the end of the paragraph.

58. **Mr. Seth** (Committee Secretary) drew attention to the statement of programme budget implications contained in A/C.2/60/L.70, noting that, as described in paragraph 3, the costs of the four round tables associated with the High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development were estimated at $55,200. As mentioned in paragraph 8, it had been determined after review that the additional meeting and conference servicing requirements were beyond the absorptive capacity of the provisions to be made under section 2 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007. The amendment to paragraph 7 of the draft resolution did not alter the fact that more resources would be needed.

59. **The Chairman** said that Belarus had joined the sponsors. A recorded vote had been requested on paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.62.

60. **Mr. Kotis** (United States of America) said that while his delegation was in general supportive of the draft resolution and of the High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development, it had requested a recorded vote on paragraph 7 because the costs involved were beyond the absorptive capacity of the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007. Therefore, his delegation would vote against the inclusion of the paragraph.

61. **Mr. Sunaga** (Japan) said that his delegation would vote against the inclusion of the paragraph, and reserved the right to comment further during the debate in the Fifth Committee on the second performance report. It was disappointed that it had not been possible to avoid programme budget implications, and urged that every effort should be made to find redundancies.

62. *A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.62.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic,

Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Japan, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Israel.

63. *Paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.62 was adopted by 159 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.*

64. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.62 was adopted as orally amended and corrected.*

65. **Ms. Haycock** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union had been pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution but was concerned that the Committee had been informed of its programme budget implications at such a late stage in its consideration. It would take up those concerns when the relevant section of the proposed programme budget was considered in the Fifth Committee.

66. **Ms. Brown** (Canada) said that her delegation aligned itself with the statement of the United Kingdom on behalf of the European Union.

The meeting was suspended at 6 p.m. and rose at 6.50 p.m.